

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
APPLICATION NO.		09/05/2000	Markus Weisbeck	MO-5845/LEA3	6993	
09/601,152		03/03/2000		EXAMINER		
157	7590	01/21/2004		JOHNSON, E	JOHNSON, EDWARD M	
BAYER POLYMERS LLC					PAPER NUMBER	
100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205		15205		ART UNIT PAPER NUMB		
PITTSBUR	GH, PF	13203		1754		
				DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/601,152	
Advisory Action	Examiner	WEISBECK ET AL.
	Edward M. Johnson	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		1754
	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR void abandonment of this application of the property of the propert	R ALLOWANCE. ation. A proper reply to a
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire one of the content of the	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the shortened statutory period statutory	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	Brief must be filed within the pe	eriod set forth in f the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	- Pri- san
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE helow):
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		•
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>See</u>	reconsideration has been consid Continuation Sheet.	lered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(sexplanation of how the new or amended claims work.	s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)[ uld be rejected is provided below	☐ will be entered and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>6,8-11 and 13</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appro	ved or b) disapproved by the	e Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. Other:	STANLE	Y SILVERMON W PATEM CONTRACTO OGY CENTER 1714
TOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)	I EVINUL	ACT ACT OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR

## - Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 009/601,152

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the proposed amendment specifies a would modify the claims to present an additional and potentially imprope Markush group, which would be a new issue requiring further consideration. Applicant also alleges that the proposed amendment would limit the claimed support to "only" titanium oxide and hydrous titanium dioxide, without any further ingredients, which, if true, would also present a new issue requiring further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is argued that Muller et al. teach a method for... Office Action. This is not persuasive because Applicant appears to suggest that the proposed amendment would limit the support to a material consisting "only" of titanium dioxide or hydrous titanium dioxide. However, the proposed amendment does not contain such a limitation. And, in any case, the proposed amendment has not yet been entered. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a catalyst support consisting "only" of titanium dioxide or hydrous titanium dioxide) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).